

SPECIAL OFF-WEEK EXTRA EDITION OF NORTH AMERICA'S NUMBER-ONE DIPZINE,

THE

# BRUTUS BULLETIN

ET TU, BRUTE

# 23

OCT 14 1978

The BRUTUS BULLETIN is a bi-weekly newsletter of postal DIPLOMACY, except that this special issue makes it a weekly for a very brief spell. DIPLOMACY is a game invented by Alan Calhamer and copyrighted by the Avalon Hill Game Company. This is available at the cheap price of 12/\$3, which is just 25¢ apiece.

THIS ISSUE is a special. I've had so much come in in the way of good letters (or at least controversial letters) that I would have to either pay a potload of \$ for a double issue next week, carry over 5 pages to the NEXT issue, or run an extra one to handle the overload. That's what this is, then. By "clearing the deck" this week, I hope to have a nice, short 8-sheet issue next weekend and still keep everything current. Also, I'm counting on those 1978AX players to come through with player wrap-up statements to fill that issue. Most of you are still out! Let's hear from you, Bronx cheer or whatever!

NOTE TO OTHER PUBLISHERS: To those of you who are cussing me out, saying "That SOB runs an extra issue to carry his 'excess' letters, and I can't even get the kids to write for mine!", relax. After you read this issue, maybe you'll be glad you don't get this stuff. (Few letters within say "Summer is nice and it's dark at night"). I like them, but a lot of you might not. Console yourself with that thought.  
(Or write to Rod Walker yourself.)

GAME OPENINGS: Two regular 2-week-deadline games will be opening next month. Right now, only my tentative project of a thrice-a-month, 10-day-deadline game is open. Fees are \$3 without sub, \$2 with sub, or \$1 with sub if you are already a subscriber but have not yet played in a game. After December 1, this latter rate will apply even in the regular games, where now your sub includes 1 free gamefee. Standbys play free with sub. Other publishers CAN use this announcement as filler. Calls will be accepted in the 10-day game only, if you can get me. Assignments are by lot, except that Austria and Italy may be volunteered for.

GM & Editor: John Michalski, Rt 10, Box 526Q, Moore, Okla 73165 USA Circulation, ca. 50

## VARIOUS NOTES

WHERE'S THE GAME PAGE? Don't worry, your issue is OK. There aren't any games in this issue. Deadline is NEXT Friday, the 20th.

MARK BERCH wrote in last issue to say the Bob Lipton would in fact get his mail at merely "General Delivery, Boston MA"; well, almost. Instead of my player's statement coming back marked "Insufficient Address" as I thought, it came back marked "Unclaimed".

JERRY JONES mentioned on the phone Tuesday night that someone had nominated ME for periodicals editor of the IDA. I don't know how to take that. I'll assume it was well-intentioned. I wouldn't mind taking a hobby service job sometime down the line, when/if I was closing down BB. But from the experience of others, I wouldn't want to try to handle two jobs at once. I'd rather do one good job than two half-assed jobs. I don't think a person can properly publish AND do another side job of publishing, whether it be DIP REVIEW for the IDA or EVERYTHING for the pubbers and stat folks. Surprisingly, when I explained what it meant to Claudine, she said "I'd rather you were doing that than putting out s-- like this". She meant stuff, of course. I might have been offended, but I recall that Diplomacy Widow doesn't rank LD&NS among her favorites, either. Maybe wives are too close to the action to appreciate the outstanding jobs we're doing, right Jerry? (And why did Tony Watson say we didn't need congratulations 'because their heads are swelled enough already'?)

Speaking of TONY WATSON, his RURITANIA, an SF oriented Dipzine, has openings and is having its 50th issue due later this month or early next. Good time to ask for a sample. Write him at 201 Minnesota St, Las Vegas, NV 89107. This last issue had some Aggie jokes masquerading as Middle Eastern parables under the title "Wisdom of the Mulla". Is that an Italian mule?

LEE KENDTER SR just beat out Jerry Jones by about 12 minutes in claiming the half-dozen issues of assorted wargame zines I had for sale. Strange, since there hadn't been a nibble prior to that. The box of Dipzines is still available at this writing. See reply to Randolph Smyth's letter for details.

WELCOME NEW SUBBERS and trades: Recently added have been Charles Price, John Beamer, and Konrad Baumeister. Also, Randolph Smyth, producer of one of Canada's pillars of postal Dip, FOL SI FIE, has changed his mind and decided to trade also. See his letter inside. Still room for more, folks. I'm still willing to expand now, because I expect a certain dropping out when most subs expire Dec 1.

STATEMENT OF POLICY: Correspondents should be advised that I do publish a Dipzine, one which I try to stuff to the 2oz limit each time--sometimes, like with this issue, with more success than I'd expected, this whole issue being mere "overage". This means, though, that except for game stuff, whatever you send me not specifically marked NOT FOR PUBLICATION may well wind up in print. Also, courtesy copies are sent to non-subbing persons attacked or praised or otherwise mentioned, whenever possible. I would appreciate the same, should you opt to attack me or BB elsewhere. There's lots here to ~~mention~~ mention... Also, as a CAVEAT EMPTOR note, remember that I can produce all that I do the way I do only because my xerox and postage are subsidized via the company. Should I quit or whatever, things could dry up fast for a while. Remember I only promise to keep the GAMES moving fast in any case. However, I've been here over four years and see little to be gained by moving at this time. This situation is another reason I'm reluctant to assume a hobby service job as above, although if I fell down at that, it would hardly be an unheard of occurrence in this hobby.

# IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT

really!

An ~~IDIOT'S~~

A Brutus Bulletin Exclusive

Last night I received a call from the former BNC, Cal White (just after calls from Lee Kendter Sr and Jerry Jones--busy night!) who had just received a preview copy of the "Open Letter" of last issue. Cal has confirmed that the records are bundled, the numbers are in reasonably good order, an issue of EVERYTHING is on its way out, and Dennis should have the materials in short order. About the current situation, Cal said "It sure shows you who your friends are!" When reference was made to some of the charges made by many, such as Alan Rowland's attack on Cal in an earlier BRUTUS BULLETIN, Cal responded "Alan who?" So, aside from Cal's request to not send him any further envelopes requesting contributions for the US Olympic Team, the hobby should be getting back "on line" shortly. The issue of EVERYTHING coming out is said to be full of numbers, so Dennis should get the job with less of a backlog than has been claimed. Good news for us all!

Filler:



NORWAY  
SWEDEN  
FINLAND  
DENMARK

WHICH IS RIGHT

$$6 \overline{) 306}$$
  
$$\underline{30}$$
  
$$6$$

$$6 \overline{) 306}$$
  
$$\underline{30}$$
  
$$6$$



IT'S BEEN ONE OF THOSE DAYS.

GREG COSTIKYAN

P O Box 865, Brown U, Providence, RI 02912

Kind Sir;

What we have between you and Boardman is an argument between a peckerhead liberal and a peckerhead traditional conservative; both of you are blindly WRONG.

1. Yes, sure, Communism is nasty and evil. I'm all for wiping it out. However, International Communism is not a monolithic conspiracy aimed at the overthrow of the "free" world. The Russians are more afraid of the Chinese than they are of us. The ideological aspects of the world struggle are overemphasized; they reason we're agin the Soviets and they're agin us is that we two are the only world powers, and the continued existence of either is a threat to the other. The struggle is one of realpolitik, not ideology.
2. What calls itself communism is not always communism. Example: in asia, the world "communist" has the connotation "good". In the Western world, "communist" has the connotation bad. Thus, a reformer in Asia will call himself "communist", because his compatriots will interpret this to mean "good". Unfortunately, labelling himself a communist makes him appear "bad" in the eyes of the west. Ho Chi Minh, for instance, was a nationalist agrarian reformer. The original constitution of the independent state of Viet Nam (founded shortly after the end of WWII by Ho) was modeled on the American constitution. Diplomatic records show that Ho Chi Mihn fully expected American support in his struggle for Vietnamese independence from French colonial rule.

However, American diplomacy, as always, blundered. Because Ho called himself "communist", and the French assured us that a commie was a commie, we started on the most disastrous foreign engagement in our history---an engagement which lost us the few friends we had in Asia, alienated our European allies, and generally dissipated the stock of good will felt toward America at the end of WWII.

Now, ~~if~~ we should, of course, protect the free world against the encroachments of communism. Were Western Europe to be invaded by Soviet troops tomorrow, I'd be at the army recruiting stations the following day. Same goes for Japan or the Mideast---wherever America has vital economic or political interests. I believe in -aving people who live under free regimes for communist tyrrany. However, what has this got to do with southeast Asia? What interest---economic or political or otherwise---did we have in southeast Asia? What were we defending? We were defending tyrranical American puppet states against the encroachment of tyrranical Soviet and Chinese puppet states. Why? Who cares? How does it affect us if a million Cambodians are killed, or if the government in Saigon is leftist rather than rightist?

3. As for the present---by damn, I don't know whether you or John is a greater threat to American freedom (what's left of it). The great threat to freedom is BIGNESS---big government, big business, big organized crime---all of which now act in concert to screw the American citizen. You're basically pro-business and John is basically pro-government---but in my view, that's two sides of the same coin.

The ideal society is one in which the powers of government are extremely limited, both by checks and balances and by other forces in the society. In which a citizen is not exposed to bureaucracy except in extreme cases, and in which government officers have no right to interfere with an individual's excersize of freedom. In which a citizen doesn't pay 50% of his income in taxes, and a citizen is free to do whatever he damn pleases---including smoking dope, or shooting heroin for that matter---as long as he isn't harming anyone else in so doing.

The ideal society is one in which the free market is a reality. In which capitalist competition keeps the price of goods low and their quality high---in which no single company or group of companies can, tacitly or openly, set the prices for their goods. In America today, on the contrary, almost every industry is dominated by two or six or a dozen companies---industry is not competitive, but ~~okigakkikak~~ oligopical. American business has to be smashed to its component parts.

4. You talk about the amazing accomplishments of America. What accomplishments? All I see about me is a decadent society in the throes of collapse. Blind materialism has reached the point where it is polluting the environment to death, depleting our resources, and destroying the work ethic. Television cuts individuals off from one another---they spend hours staring blankly at a cathode ray tube, rather than talking to each other. The schools continue to decline at a precipitate rate---20% of the American population is now functionally illiterate. Crime grows tremendously. The government continues to infringe on individual rights, and continually passes new laws expanding its powers to infringe on rights. Money is no longer spent on the sciences, and thus our technological lead on the rest of the world is being narrowed. The cities continue to decay, and Congress, in self-righteous fiscal indignation, continues to let them. Bureaucracy continues to grow until every aspect of life is regulated, and every action requires the submission of a dozen forms in sextuplicate.

Amazing accomplishments? Yes, every American has all the beer he can drink, a flashy new automobile, and a color TV. The average American is also utterly miserable---he can't keep his marriage together, he spends 6 hours a day watching TV because he doesn't have anything more interesting to do, he gets drunk every night before dinner. ~~xx..~~

Why are we at this impasse? John will agree with most of what I've said---but what he doesn't realize is that most of the problems with American society are the result of the post-war liberal American dream. The dream of a materialist Utopia in which the wants of all are cared for by a paternalistic system---even at the expense of individual freedom.

But the "New Right" doesn't seem to have any real idea of the problems, either. They favor big government at the expense of big business. They wish to reduce the tyranny of bureaucracy, but at the same time increase the tyranny of "lawhorder" through strengthening of local police and government law enforcement arms. They wish to reduce government spending, but at such a precipitate rate that the economy will suffer tremendously. They wish to reduce taxation, but not government spending to the same extent---and thus move away from a balanced budget. Basically, the "New Right" is the same as the "New Left", but with a slightly different emphasis. Both want the expansion of government power, but in different sectors. Both want the continuation of American foreign power, but have slightly different goals. Neither can see that American government and the American economy require major, drastic changes if America is not to pollute itself to death, not to collapse through decadence, and not to turn into a governmentalized "socialist" tyranny.

All Hail Discordia,



Greg Costikyan

((I appreciate your taking so much time and effort to write in, even if the pages you and I will fill here are dwarfed by Rod Walker's.

I include your closing for a good reason: "all hail discordia" paraphrases your position better than I can. (Although that doesn't mean I won't comment further!). In your final summary paragraph, you lambast both John Boardman and myself, decrying the "tremendous suffering" to the economy caused by proposed "precipitate" changes, then turn right around and call for "major, drastic" changes in the economy yourself! I admire your zeal, and I think we'll have a lot in common in ten years time; right now, though, you let yourself get too wrapped up and carried away in anarchist rhetoric. What we have here is a peckerhead Leftist and peckerhead Rightist being attacked by an inexperienced peckerhead Anarchist. I of the three of us am least

Lithuanian

blind. I can see why you others think as you do, and can see why you're wrong. Also, I'm open to reasoning. I hope you are; I know Boardman isn't. In my view, you lack some maturity and experience; Boardman lacks sense. Since I think there is a lot of hope for you, I will respond to the points of your letter.

1."The Communist-Western struggle is simply Realpolitik, not ideology." Bullshit. Even when there were three ideologies in the world rather than two, and the other two at war, we were still under attack while helping the Communists. They are ALWAYS opposed to us, peace or war, good times or bad, strong or weak on one side or the other or both. Realpolitik is the tool; ideology is the root cause.

2. "In Asia, Communist means good". Perhaps in Communist China, Cambodia, or Vietnam. And even then, often only 'for the record'. Does Communist mean good in Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the Phillipines, Indonesia, Malaya, Thailand, India, Pakistan, or the Middle East? Even those countries that accept massive Communist aid generally jail their native Commies, except Indonesia, where they're killed off. Ho Chi Minh was both a nationalist agrarian reformer and a Communist. Yet when the interests of Vietnam and the interests of international Communism were at odds, he opted for the party line, not Vietnam's good. Sure his constitution is modeled on ours; the Soviet constitution grants its peoples even more autonomy than does our own (the right to secede, for instance), but the Caucasian and Ukrainian people who tried that found just how much the constitution meant, too. Those People's Democratic Republics are about as interested in the People, and as Democratic, and as close to a Republic as the Holy Roman Empire was Holy, Roman, or an Empire. It only fools people who are naieve enough to judge Communists by what they SAY rather than by what they DO.

"How does it affect us if a million Cambodians are killed?" How indeed. What does . . . it matter if the gov't in Berlin is leftist or rightist, or if every Jew in Europe is rounded up for slaughter? Who, outside NYC and Miami, cares? See the point?

3. Too bad Boardman and I both have the same first name, as at times it's hard to tell which of us you're hitting when.

I won't argue what the "ideal" state should be; it's a waste of time. I will point out your SERIOUS error, though, in tooting how our government should let the individual freely smoke pot and shoot dope, then turn right around and attack the government for allowing people the right to spend . . . time and money as they see fit if that choice happens to be watching TV or buying a flashy car. You prefer they buy dope instead? Come off it, Greg; you're getting like Boardman yourself. You want everyone to be free to do as YOU think they ought to. It doesn't work that way. Our society gives people enough leisure and wealth that they can spend hours and \$ a day as they see fit. Just because they opt not to follow the plans of you or other utopians, choosing to spend that time on a color TV to watch and beer to drink instead of writing poetry, rapping with a guru, or smoking pot, hardly constitutes any crime. Except to you, it seems. The system has given them free choice, time, and money: just because they don't use it as YOU want them to is hardly a failure of the system. It's just tough beans. You and the Left can try to destroy all that bigness that produced all this, never before (and never again?) possible in human history, and we can all be Jefferson's "nation of small farmers", or at least that 12% of us that survive the famine. It is that Bigness that chugs out all those goods and services; destroy it and we become subsistence farmers. Then we can avoid TV, since we'll be lucky to have electricity; cut down on beer, since we'll have to work sunup to sundown to survive; marriages will last, because you'll need each other to survive, whether you can stand each other or not; and all the kids will learn the three Rs, because that's all the little red schoolhouses will teach. The only good thing is that the potheads and ivory tower dreamers like you and Boardman (resp.) will be unlikely to expound on after that first winter. Countries in this world with lots of subsistence farmers hardly heed the call of those who preach turn on-tune in-drop out; rather, those countries are eager-to-desperate for all that polluting industrialization to help lift them out of

Reply to Costikyan

all that pristine natural living and replace it with a nice, grubby factory job! "The proof of the pudding is in the eating"; and everyone on this planet, especially our enemies, seeks no more than this very decadence you so deplore. In 4., you foolishly ask "What accomplishments?". Even granting that you may never have walked down a village street in SE Asia as I have--and I hope you never have to!--anyone except someone of perhaps Boardman's fairyland outlook can see that there is a hell of a lot of accomplishment here; much more, in fact, than any group under any philosophy in a million years of human history has managed to produce. You say the average American is utterly miserable--exaggeration aside, is not this discontent with the state of things on the physical side, a result more of wanting even MORE rather than less? Or are you . . . saying that, despite your talk of 'freedom' again, that you know better than Joe Schmoe what it is he should want more of instead? Everyone wants less government, only everyone wants to do so without cutting back on their own pet areas. In a democracy, the resulting compromises mean that ALL parts of government only grow. Our 'bigness' neo-capitalist (or oligarchic system, if you will) has produced so much that 1 person on the farm feeds twenty, one in the factory provides for ten, leaving about 3 out of 5 in the end without useful work when all is said and done. After advertising creates 'needs' for useless trivia, employing many, government is left to absorb the rest. Only in this respect are you close to correct in the Left being different 'only-in-emphasis' from the Right: the Right would put them in the Army, while the Left puts them into HEW. The pay is better, I guess. Aside from that, though, I have to take ~~strong~~ exception with your comparing the Right to the Left as being "only slightly different" in emphasis. A Right policy might be personified under the dictum "Wipe your own ass" while the Left would have McGovern set up a new federal agency to program and carry out a comprehensive national program of everyone's ass being wiped for them at specified intervals. The Right urges a balanced budget first; other 'changes in emphasis' that might build up, say, the border patrol, . . . only mean deeper cuts must be made in HEW, etc. The Left views a balanced budget as patent failure of the gov't to do its job. That's a lot more than a 'slight difference in emphasis'.

Odds and ends: Ho Chi Minh as an "agrarian reformer". That's a good one . They said the same about Mao and Fidel too, and correctly. In China, the landlords were killed and the land seized by the state 'for all the people'. In Cambodia, the Jeffersonian ideal is achieved instantly by the simple expedient of marching the urban population into the countryside en masse; Communists always bring such 'agrarian reform'. But to call these Communist tyrants "agrarian reformers" is akin to . . . describing a hurricane as a movement of air! Lastly, Communism's monolithic nature. True, it's splitting up. Just like the hordes of Ghengis Khan, they can't be stopped militarily, it seems, but the surviving culture of the conquered peoples is having its effect. Just because the Khanate has many leaders, however, doesn't protect Europe. And certainly the Russians are afraid of the Chinese more than of us; hell, we might not fight to protect ourselves, let alone take overt foreign ACTION. The Chinese, however, have no pacifists in their midsts, no one to say, 'sit back and relax.' They have the moral fortitude to act in their own behalf without feeling any guilt. We're pushovers, compared to China. So sure the Russians watch them warily. Who ELSE stands as a threat to Moscow's world dominance? Does that make us safe in turn?

Unlike Boardman, I trust that time and experience will be a valuable aid in bringing both your school and mine to a consensus sometime, based on what I've seen of yours before; but . . . for . . . now, for the above, you're all wet. ))

(writing

(( Anyone else care to comment? ))

J.M.

ROD WALKER

"alcala"  
 1273 crest dr.  
 encinitas CA 92024  
 30 september 1978

Dear John:

BB #21 & your note here today. Look...look, a new dark ribbon so's you won't have to turn the xerox on high if you want to reproduce this turkey. Enclosed, if I remember it, is a copy of the infamous "Walker Hate Sheet", which is sent on rare occasion to certain deserving recipients. Tretick/"Oaklyn" may become the first person in the history of the hobby to receive two of them.

Lucretia is, of course, my favorite PR character, having first appeared in game 1966AA, in GRAUSTARK. That game generated more press than any other except perhaps 1965R, if I recall correctly. She became Pope Joan II when she deposed her father, Innocent XIV. She presently lives in retirement in Sicily. She will eventually make a comeback in something I may yet complete and get published, "In the Service of Her Holiness, the Pope". These are at least in part the memoirs of Count Vissarion ("Vissi") d'Arte, Her Holiness' Private Secretary (but everyone called him the "Ecumenical Pimp", although not to his face, of course). Other portions are from the casebook of the English ambassador & famous private detective, Sir Henry Orfal-Dorfal. Also the Memoirs of the Austro-Hungarian ambassador, Count Radu von Drakul, "My Death and Times".

On to Boardman. John is of course no stranger to using phoney names. He played Turkey in postal game 1964C under the name "Eric Blake". Unfortunately, he played England in the same game under his own name. Guess who "won"? If this suggests to you that John's sense of propriety and/or honesty is out of whack, you are right. During the 1968 election, Boardman ran an "Eleven-foot Poll" on peoples' preferences. He promised in print that all responses would be kept strictly confidential. After the "Poll" was complete, he proceeded to publish the names of all those who said they would vote for George Wallace, denouncing them as "racists". His response to complaints that he had broken his promise on confidentiality was, essentially, the the moral superiority of his position took precedence over any obligation he might have to keep his word.

I should add that it is John's firm belief that the moral superiority of his position also takes precedence over any obligation he might have to tell the truth.

Or any obligation he might have to be consistent. His horror over the largely imaginary excesses committed against "pacifists" is totally inconsistent with his attitude toward South Africa. He has frequently advocated the murder of the Prime Minister of the RSA and has looked forward with smug satisfaction to the possible genocide of the Afrikaans population there.

The truth is that John is no pacifist and has never been one. He is of the radical left. As Terry Kuch once so rightly observed, "John Boardman has no objection to concentration camps, so long as the right people are in them". Terry might have added that John has no real objection to war, so long as the right people are being killed.

In John's mind, there are only two kinds of people: those who agree with him and warmongers. GRAUSTARK has always shown this sort of attitude. Nothing shows it more than John's "conversion". He has

(30 september 1978)

2.

long masqueraded as a pacifist because the wars he opposed were not killing the right people. His switch to the "other side" was just as ludicrous as his original position and was largely a put-on. John has not changed his political beliefs one whit. Everything he writes about being in favor of "war" and "imperialism" shows that he is still on the radical left.

Do not make the mistake of assuming John is anything like a liberal. He is, alas, nothing more than a Nazi of the left. His hatreds are legion and his intolerance is broad-spectrum. The "right people" in Boardman's concentration camps would include Catholics, gays, conservatives, moderates, "capitalists", and large numbers of people in the sf fan, postal Diplomacy, and amateur publishing circles. I would guess he would also consign there anyone guilty of using the scientific method. He is a mass of passionate prejudices and as bigoted as any Marine that ever joined the KKK.

Cambodia: What happened there & is happening there is a disaster. It is inconceivable that a people would commit genocide against itself, and yet that is what is happening.

My own solution is, like McGovern's, a military invasion to put a stop to the whole horrid thing. Cambodia would be made a trust territory under the UN administered by a commission representing China, the USSR, Vietnam, France, and Thailand. However, the lack of intervention there is (as much as anything) a clear indication of the great tension between China and the USSR.

I don't see a direct alliance with China. A Sino-Soviet war is probably less than 10 years away and there is no reason for us to be put in a position which might involve us in the conflict. Everything which has been happening in the Indian Ocean, and in Africa, must ultimately be understood in terms of that coming clash. The two protagonists are sparring, each trying to outflank the other. If the USSR can hold in Africa and in an arc stretching from the Black Sea through Ceylon to Vietnam, China's position will be badly enough compromised that she may not attack Russia. As it is, I am still predicting that by 1985 the war will break out (or at least be imminent), and that when it does China will win it.

The odd thing about Boardman's predictions of "Prop 13 disaster" in California is that one does not hear such things here. Alternate sources of revenue are being found, cuts are being made, and adjustments are taking place. The State surplus has long since been budgeted to cover the entire fiscal year, not just a few months. By fiscal 1980, income to most governmental units in the State will be within a few percentage points of fiscal 1978. There will be changes here, but no disaster. This is not New York.

Re: the Birsan/Tretick story. Hearing Edi tell it is best, of course. However, see "Buddy As I Knew Him" in DIPLOMACY WORLD 12 (Vol. III, #2). I recounted the entire story there.

I'm not in a position to judge whether "Operation Dropshot" really existed or whether it's another "Iron Mountain" hoax. However, what John fails to realize (well, he does, but he will never admit it) is that every country's military prepares for all sorts of contingencies and possibilities. In the early 1920s, for instance, we had fairly

Yes, more Walker

(30 september 1978)

3.

detailed plans for a naval war against England [?]. John pretends to assume that the existence of such contingency plans is ipso facto proof of intent to execute them. That's rubbish. There are hundreds of such plans at any given moment. The military has a duty to be ready to carry out any operation the President might order, so everything even remotely likely is anticipated in various sorts of operational plans.

As to Soviet aggressive intentions: In a way both you and Boardman are right. Expansionism is frequently a result of insecurity. It is not unfair to say that after World War II the Soviet Union felt surrounded by American military might (the USSR has a syndrome of feeling surrounded which dates from the early 20s). They felt threatened by our direct presence in Germany and Japan, by our nuclear weapons, and by their own real weakness. The response was exactly what any reasonable person would expect: the creation of a defensive cordon of friendly states, emphasis of military buildup and weapons development, and a propaganda effort designed to weaken what they perceived to be our inimical intentions. It's not surprising that the Soviet response would be couched in terms similar to the old "down with capitalism" litany of two generations earlier. However, the entire history of the modern period shows that states will often use the universalist pretensions of the national church to support the particularist objectives of the national government. In other words, the Marxist cant of "world revolution" was only a cover for Russian imperialism.

In dealing with the Soviet Union, the image I like to bear in mind is one of a paranoid, powerful man with rustic brusqueness but urban cunning, armed with a .45 and an M-16. You might be similarly armed; you might even be better armed, or even less well armed (say, a .38 and an M-1). In any event, you will deal with him the same way: be very cautious and wary; firm, but never belligerant.

Recall Soviet history: prior to the devastating German invasion, most of Russia's neighbors and peers faced her with varying degrees of distaste and hostility. From 1915 to 1924, the USSR sustained a series of invasions and occupations by every major power on the globe and a good many of the minor ones. The U.S. had armed forces occupying parts of Siberia and northern Russia. Nations have long memories; no wonder they find it difficult to trust us.

Nor should we trust them overmuch. Nations have personalities much as human beings. I characterized the USSR as somewhat paranoid; she is. Never turn your back on a paranoid. But don't threaten him, either... even so, let him know you're watching him. Surprisingly, our foreign policy has of late been pretty good at finding the balance between the two foolish extremes one normally hears advocated: the excesses of antagonism and surrender.

Oh...the notion that Len Lakofka has ever done, or would ever have done, what I told him to is ludicrous. Boardman's claim that I was somehow using Len's name is a complete surprise to me, as I've never heard that before. I'd guess ~~HXX~~ he's still burned over the fact that I was one of the most vocal members of the movement to get 1964C (his only "win" in postal Diplomacy) removed from all rating lists because he had played in the game under two names. If I had wanted to operate in the hobby under another name, you can bet it would not have been Len Lakofka's. In any event, I find John's notion particularly

(30 September 1978)

4.

amusing because Len was who he was...that is, because Len was the kind of person he was, confusing him with me is absolutely hilarious. If John really has something factual with which to back up that idea, I'd sure like to see it.

Therefore: open challenge to John Boardman. I dare you to produce evidence that I pretended to be Len Lakofka. I double-dare you. Come on, ~~Fif~~, um, John, put up or shut up. [Well, that's just ridiculous. Like me, John will never shut up.]

Finally (I hope): I've been on the phone with Doug Beyerlein. We will be doing something to clear up the Boardman Number business shortly. I don't know exactly what because I have one plan and he has another. His is quicker and easier if it works, so he's trying his first. I should know by tomorrow what the outcome is. If my plan is to go into operation, I hope to begin setting up by Monday...in which case a xerox copy of a circular letter will be enclosed.


Enclosed also is the current edition of the NAVB Flyer. You may wish to reprint.

Well, a bit about Carter. You are right that he isn't the most inspiring figure. In fact, since Kennedy there has been nothing of any significant charisma in the White House. Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower (and Kennedy) were quite different in that regard from Johnson, Nixon, Ford, and Carter. Although I voted for Carter, I will not be too unhappy if he is not renominated. His administration has a patchy quality to it. The most interesting thing is his utter failure to make use of the inherent power of the Presidency to spearhead movements, galvanize opinion, and prod Congress. Quite frankly, if the next election is a repeat of the Carter-Ford contest, I am not at all sure how my vote will be cast.

Our basic problem is that the nation's problems demand a man of vision and decisive leadership. Ford offers neither, but he is solid and dependable. Carter's vision has its moments and he is occasionally effective as a leader, but the whole effect is spotty. I suppose the choice is between lackluster consistency or a sort of populist manic-depressive cycle. Kennedy has the best chance of making it over Carter, but I'm not altogether enthused by him. Jerry Brown would be a much better choice, but has less chance. Pity.

Hmm...back to Lucretia for a moment. The "Hate Sheet" shows her in rather informal attire. As Pope, she was more wont to wear white...you know, a little white skullcap, a floor-length white hassock (decolleté to the naval in front and somewhat lower in back), white patent-leather boots with spurs, and a bullwhip or cat-o'-ninetails. And gloves. Many sources refer to Lucy as "blonde", but only her hairdresser knew for sure. [Well, that's not true. The entire Swiss Guard knew for sure. So did a number of visiting dignitaries, every soccer team in Rome, the Harvard rowing team, the Tsar, most of the Presidents of France, half the College of Cardinals, and a certain Watusi warrior named Mdongo. (Lucy is not what you'd call your Prime Time Pope.)

Best,



Reply to Walker

((All I can say is, 'wow'. Alan Rowland used to complain how bland most letters here were; I doubt he'll think so about this issue, if he reads it. Talk about laying it on the line... Usually it is best, as a matter of general policy, to be "moderate", i.e., bland, but that means in turn that when an open, frank letter comes along, it strikes like a blast of crisp autumn air. The bluntness is refreshing, I believe.

Re Boardman: On the 'moral superiority' issue, it has been my belief that this attitude is quite pervasive on the Left, and increasingly so the further left one goes. Thus to Communists at the far end, it means little that their own countrymen in Cambodia are decimated by the takeover, for the deaths of millions count for little when weighed against the justness of their cause. The Cause, in turn, is justified because it is all for the good of the people! To Communists and their fellow travellers, this all makes sense. Maybe Boardman can explain it to us.

On our foreign policy having struck a good balance, I must disagree. First, outside of southern Africa, I don't see as we HAVE a foreign policy. We do a little strong-arming in the Middle East, and maintain (if nothing more) our NATO duties; in South Africa, we work hard for Communist victory. But beyond that, what? I think the 'balance' you speak of between antagonism and surrender is just the unintentional by-product of our having no foreign policy to speak of. I think that just as Roosevelt thought he could win over 'Uncle Joe' Stalin by giving him everything he wanted and getting nothing back, so Carter feels he can deal with the Kremlin. Perhaps he's hoping they'll all get born again?

The Russians probably have a historical paranoia, but that can hardly blind them to the realities of today. The US has always been on the defensive, even when we were strong and in undisputed control. Rather than a wary paranoid, I would characterize the Russian as a wary opportunist. Like Mao put it, "When the enemy advances, retreat; when he stops, harass; when he retreats, attack". Irregardless of your own demonstrated intents, all that matters is your strength vs theirs. Their goal is unaffected by your nature or intents; only your own 'advances or retreats' (or their destruction) will have an effect. While it is true that Russia has sustained many invasions, not only this century, the same can be said of most every other European state. The unique thing in Russia is not a history of invasions, but the iron grip of Communism on that state's strength.

On the candidates: I agree with your assessments of the main two mentioned, Carter and Ford. This last Kennedy has only the family name, little more; I think he would be viewed as a hustler using the name, rather than a new standard-bearer. Also, as a Kennedy, he is much hated in places, as well as loved in other constituencies. I supported the first Kennedy, and so was surprised to find later (after leaving Wisconsin) how much opposed he was outside the NE. (I'd never really seen anti-Catholic hatreds either, but SW Pennsylvania opened my eyes). I think he would stand a high danger of some nut 'finishing the pattern' of wiping that clan out, and those sort of actions set very bad internal precedents, irregardless of the merits/demerits one sees in any given subject. Jerry Brown has been pictured to me the way Reagan is to the Left: emotional, erratic, kind of touch-and-go in the sanity dept....I really haven't heard anything of him at all after his escapades in the 76 campaigns. There in California, I'm sure it's a different story. (With maybe one subber in 6 or 7 in CA, any others care to write on Jerry?)

Finally, I gather from your letter that Len Lakofka is a real person. I always thought he was a hobby creation or characterization, rather than anyone real. You know, kind of like Robert Sacks is?

Thanks for taking the time to write (and providing half an issue!) ))

J.W.

Filler:

PO Box 626  
San Diego, CA 92112, USA  
September 1, 1978

Dear DIPLOMACY publisher,

Walt Buchanan, publisher of DIPLOMACY WORLD and keeper of the hobby archives, has returned to university this fall in pursuit of a graduate degree in engineering. He therefore feels that he must "consolidate his commitments," which in English means that he must farm out some of his Diplomacy "chores" for a while.

Therefore, effective immediately the following changes are to be made in the system:

1. From this point on the hobby archives will be accumulated through the DIPLOMACY WORLD editorial office (letterhead). The editor is not going to maintain the archives, but he will act as the funnel for material. Please send all trade copies, effective today, to PO Box 626, San Diego, CA 92112, USA. (To those few of you who are still using Conrad's home address, please stop; I'm in process of moving out.)

2. The Editor of DIPLOMACY WORLD is going to maintain a roster of active publishers, and keep records of frequency of publication, to be used eventually in a kind of Consumer Reports rating of the press. To be able to be fair to all publishers, I need to know right away if you either (1) do not intend to send any copies to the Archives (= cancel your trade), or (2) plan to send archives copies in batches of several - which is perfectly all right, but I need to know so I won't make an idiot of myself declaring you defunct while you're stacking up copies to be sent on later.

3. The Need a Game listing will hereinafter be prepared by Conrad, not Walt. This will necessitate a few changes here: From now on I will require specific notification from you if you wish to be listed in Need a Game. Merely sending along the issue that lists game openings will not do it; you must arrange that my attention be called to the data, as I will not be culling 'zines (sorry Mick) for these listings. Also, Need a Game will in future list variants as well as regular openings (by title of game), internationally-open overseas games, and game fee structures. This last point is required; no listing will be made without full information on costs. Please arrange that this be supplied along with your request for listing.


Until October 1, 1978, Walt will continue maintaining the archives; after that he won't. Please make the above changes right away, or we'll all be in a hell of a bind. And thanks, guys.

Best regards,

*Conrad - pao -*

Conrad Friesner von Motzke

Below is a reduced version of the Walker Hate Sheet sent as a sample, as referred to in the Walker letter this issue.



ROY SMITH, of BREW & REEFER, replying to Rod Walker. In the interests of keeping BB an open forum for all views, etc., as well as a shortage of time, I run the letters on this sheet without my own commentary/response. J.W.

Dear Rod,

I'd like to throw in my two cents, if I may, about the Oaklyn/Tretick mess. Since I like to see my name in print, and since I think that what I have to say is worth being read by others, I am sending a copy to John Michalski for publication.

I read your letter to Alan Rowland in the September 22 issue of BB. For the sake of those who havn't seen it, I will quote from your last paragraph;

"What you ((Alan Rowland)) believe is not material; for that matter, what I believe is not material. The only important thing is whether FLD will become a respectable and dependable publication."

For that statement, I applaud you, Rod Walker. I was starting to think that the entire hobby had gone off its collective rocker. If you'll take a little honest criticism from a nobody in the hobby, I think that you have been making somewhat of an A-hole out of yourself with your ravings about Bernie being Buddy and not letting him play in the games you are to be Guest GMing. I think that Mr. Oaklyn has been making even a bigger A-hole out of himself by carrying on about getting the FBI to haul you away for mail fraud, discrimination, and being an all-around naughty boy.

I have known Bernie for considerably less time than you, so I don't feel that it is my place to pass judgement. HOWEVER, I am playing in a game with Bernic, and am GMing a game with Bernie in it. I have my own opinion as to whether or not Bernie is Buddy (which I am going to keep to myself) but the man has made it clear to me that he wishes to be addressed as Bernie Oaklyn so, if for no other reason than old-fashioned respect for another person's wishes, I am going to call him Bernie Oaklyn. Damn, he could be Clark Kent, or even Richard Nixon for that matter. If he puts out a good 'zine, I'll trade with him. If he proves to be a trustworthy player, I'll ally with him. If he doesn't NMR out, I'll let him play in my games.

Please don't misunderstand me. I am not saying that you should let him play in your games. That is up to you and Don and Richard. What I am saying is that there are two questions that have to be answered. First, and foremost, Does it really make a difference whether Bernie is Buddy? Second (to be answered only if the answer to the first is 'yes'), is Bernie Buddy? I think that I have made it clear that my answer to the first is a qualified 'No'. Why do I qualify it? When the game that I am GMing started, I wrote Bernie a letter asking him if he is Buddy. I informed him of my house rule about deceiving the GM, and told him that whatever he replied would be confidential, and that no matter what he said I would let him play. However, if it later turns out that he has lied to me, I would remove him from the game. Until that time, I will assume that he has told me the truth.

Best,

cc: John Michalski  
Bernie Oaklyn

Roy Smith

5 October 1978

JOHN BOARDMAN

((Censored blocks name Mr 'Guess Who' of last issue.)) J.W.

I see that Don Miller now rejects Oaklyn's claim that Miller will vouch for his authenticity. Unless Tretick/Oaklyn is confusing Don Miller of Wheaton, Md. with Dan Miller of Rockville, Md., this looks fairly authentic.

A person representing himself to be Oaklyn phoned in his "Fall 1901" and "Winter 1901" moves in Game LXXVIII last night. He has a high, clear tenor voice. I have never met Tretick so I can not give any further evidence.

I have seen nothing that makes me retract my theory that there is an Oaklyn separate from Tretick. There is also a Lakofka separate from Walker. But the opinions that come into postal Diplomacy from Lakofka are actually Walker's, and the opinions and moves that come into postal Diplomacy from Oaklyn are really Tretick's.

Now, I suppose, we will have a subsidiary controversy should [REDACTED] deny that he wrote the two letters of which you sent me copies. This whole business is quickly ramifying beyond its worth. If you keep in mind that Rod Walker and Buddy Tretick are a couple of the slipperiest and most dishonest characters to come down the pike since postal Diplomacy was founded, you won't go far wrong. Other evidence seems to be coming in that Oaklyn's opinions are really Tretick's, but on Rod Walker's word alone I wouldn't believe that Christmas follows December 25th.

I don't propose to publish [REDACTED]'s letter or to contact him or to do anything else whatever about the matter. However, you might find the press releases in Game LXXVIII about "Buddy and Bernie" interesting. (See the next bundle of 3rd-class mail which I send you.)

At the present postal rates I don't intend to let this letter go without filling it up to one ounce. You may be interested in the enclosed comments about two of the major British fantasy writers of our century.

RANDOLPH SMYTH (of FOL SI FIE)

249 First Ave, Ottawa, Ontario K1S 2G5

I see your sub is expired. My list of subbers has ballooned in the last couple of months (I guess going over #100 does that) so I'm in a position to take on a few more traders. Would you be interested in a BB/FSF exchange? As I think I mentioned last time, there's no way I can play in a zine on less than four week deadlines, but I enjoyed the BB samples I have for reading value alone.

If you accept, could you actually send a personal note rather than just sending BB? Otherwise I don't guarantee that my filing system and memory can handle a mysterious arrival...

((OK, done. I am pleased to accept a trade with FSF, another high-ranked zine in the Leeder poll. Randolph issues a LARGE zine compared to most, with lots of non-game stuff such as a Russian Campaign "replay" type thing at the moment, plus a ton of press reminiscent of 77KS here. Recommended))

((While I'm on plugs, I think I'm overdue on my perennial plug of Mark Berch's DIPLOMACY DIGEST. DD is purely a reading zine, no games. It contains lots of material, reprinting goodies from the entire hobby's publishing history, with occasional new material as well. If you don't get it, you should. One excellent way to try it as well as other popular and famous zines such as RUNESTONE and MIXUMAXU GAZETTE would be to send \$2.20 to ME for a stationery boxful of these and other assorted zines. For less than the price of one sub, you get over four pounds of stuff all at once, ppd 4th class. Write editor today!))

J.W.

# Bureaucratic Blunders

Parents in Austin, Tex., are encouraging their children to purposely flunk kindergarten screening tests. The reason? Only economically deprived or educationally handicapped children may attend full-day kindergarten classes free of charge. Others must pay \$30 per month.

(Robert W. Fletcher)

told in June that they could not say grace before eating a meal funded under a federal grant.

(Gene Malone)

\* \* \*

The feds, acting under a 1975 law requiring bilingual ballots if a sizeable portion of a population speaks a language other than English, are insisting that Robeson County, N.C., print ballots in both English and Lumbee. Lumbee, in case you didn't know, is the language of the Lumbee Indians, although Robeson County election director James McDowell says the local Indians no longer understand Lumbee and that, in fact, the language no longer exists.

(R. S. Kjarval)

\* \* \*

✓ The Pennsylvania Advisory Committee of that liberal bastion, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, has issued a report entitled, "The Last Suffrage Frontier: Enfranchising Mental Hospital Patients." Those liberals always know where their votes are.

\* \* \*

A Colorado "feminist collective," Virago, has received \$41,006 in CETA funds. (Virago has produced the "Leaping Lesbian Follies," performed in the nude and, in violation of the law, for women only.) Another CETA grant provided five staff members for the National Gay Task Force office in New York City. And HEW awarded a \$50,000 grant to the Center for Homosexual Education and Research at San Francisco State University to study "Civil Liberties and Sexual Orientation."

\* \* \*

A lesbian "husband" was ordered to pay \$100 per month support to her "wife" by a San Diego, Calif., Superior Court judge this June.

(Dan M. Jacobson)

\* \* \*

Under a Dade County, Fla., regulation a Miami blind woman is being paid \$17,000 per year for her taxi fare to drive to and from work. The 88-mile round trip from her home to the snack bar she runs costs \$72 per day.

(Carolyn R. Hearrell)

\* \* \*

The mother of world heavyweight champ Leon Spinks, who won \$320,000 in his fight against Mohammed Ali, is receiving several hundred dollars from state and federal welfare programs.

(Harold R. Sprout)

\* \* \*

Three Coast Guardsmen have been kicked off President Carter's honor guard because their hair is too short.

(Helen B. Miller)

\* \* \*

OSHA has ordered a David, Calif., ranch manager to label one of the bathrooms in the ranchhouse he lives in "Men" and the other "Women," although the man lives alone. The same lonesome rancher was ordered by the California State Compensation Insurance Fund Agriculture Safety Commission to hold "safety meetings" of from five to 15 minutes "attended by all employees" on a regular basis to discuss safety rules and procedures.

(R. MacCutcheon)

\* \* \*

A group of senior citizens at Chicago's Queen of Angels Catholic Church was

A near-illiterate was hired at \$100 per day by HEW as a "consultant" to evaluate a federal reading program. Among programs receiving federal aid she was asked to evaluate was a remedial reading and math course. Here are some examples of her writing:

"There is no realistically promises that addresses the needs identified in the proposed program."

"The objectivities did not specify to the quantifiable of the success of the proposed program."

"No specified services that can verify the emphasizes to an individual."

(Harold B. Johnson)



An ornately printed booklet, *Black Americans in Congress* (costing taxpayers \$15,999 for the last Congress and \$58,384 for this Congress), lists Barbara Jordan (D-Tex.) as the "First Black Woman Governor in U.S. History." Ms. Jordan, of course, has never been elected governor of Texas, but the pamphlet's compiler explained to a curious taxpayer that she was once "Governor for a Day" under a kind of adult Girls' State program.



\$9 Million Goat Path. After spending \$9 million to construct this stretch of superhighway in Pennsylvania, the state's transportation department abandoned the project, poured eight inches of dirt onto the completed section, and then seeded it, creating a perfect goat path.

**TO WORK, TO WORK,  
THE I.G.S ARE COMIN'.**



# Peoples Gas System Educational Matching Gifts Program



Peoples Gas Company  
Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America  
The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company  
North Share Gas Company  
Harper Oil Company  
Industrial Fuels Corporation

## EDUCATIONAL MATCHING GIFTS PROGRAM

Under an Educational Matching Gifts Program, effective October 1, 1978, Peoples Gas Company and its major operating subsidiaries will make contributions to eligible schools in amounts equal to gifts made by employees and their spouses within certain limits.

The purpose of the Educational Matching Gifts Program is twofold: (1) to encourage employees to give financial support to institutions of higher learning, and (2) through matching employee gifts, to help these institutions meet steadily increasing financial needs.

### DETAILS OF PROGRAM

#### Employee Eligibility:

All regular full time employees of Peoples Gas Company and wholly owned subsidiaries with one or more years of service are eligible. The employee need not have attended the school to which the gift is made.

Not eligible are part-time or temporary employees, retired employees, and employees of joint-venture companies or those in which Peoples Gas has a

interest.

the Peoples  
College

Talk about your basic ripoff.....

I. They must be recognized by the Internal Revenue Service as tax exempt educational fund-raising efforts.

2. It must be certified that all contributions made to them are transmitted to the eligible institution(s).

An institution applying for a matching grant must certify that the gift it has received from the system employee is unrestricted in nature and does not represent any payment for tuition, room, board, alumni association dues, or any other specific service rendered or to be rendered.

#### Program Details:

Peoples Gas system companies will match gifts from \$5.00 to \$1,000 made by each eligible employee and his/her spouse during each fiscal year (October 1 to September 30). If gifts are made to more than one institution during any one year the company will match those gifts up to an aggregate of \$1,000 per employee and spouse. To qualify, gifts must be paid not merely pledged.

Gifts of securities will be matched in dollars, subject to the above limitations. The value of securities will be determined by the company on the mean high-low sales price on the day on which the gift is made.

The company reserves the right to revise, amend, suspend or terminate the program at any time. The interpretation, application and administration of the program shall be determined by the company, and its decisions shall be final.

### HOW THE PROGRAM WORKS

participate in the  
must fill out Part I  
the gift to

This is a copy of a new "benefit" program recently handed down by our parent company, People's Gas of Chicago (the gas co. there). On its face, it seems innocuous enough, not much different than any of a hundred similar things in other companies. True, it benefits only the top people, with a little thinking, since lower folks have no alma maters, care less, and mainly can't afford to give gifts to schools. The latter holds true for the middle too. So, it is a break, a nice gesture, to the top-ranking people. Most bennies are. Consider for a moment, though, where these \$1000 matching grants will come from. People's doesn't make money by gouging other corporations it sells its product to; every dime (7 out of 8, really) comes out of the pockets of the working man paying his gas bill in the city of Chicago. Colleges need help; but should it come, even in a small way, by involuntary charges on the worker's gas bill? If, as is really the case, the company finds too much money on hand with a rate hearing coming up, what better way to get rid of some \$ quick? However, wouldn't it be fairer to take out an ad in the Tribune and tell everyone to knock 50¢ off their next gas bill? Sadly, this is far from unique in business, even though in this case it is too small a matter for anyone to much care. (That's another benefit of the plan to the company). But it shouldn't be.

J.M.

# DISCO

Occasionally, I am told that my hatred for disco is irrational---that I am simply rejecting a new form of music as so many people have rejected new forms of music before me. I maintain that this is not the case. Yes, my musical tastes were more or less established during the 60's (despite the fact that I am currently in college), and thus I don't particularly like soft rock, country, etcetera, and can't really listen to punk: but still, all of these are forms of music; disco is not.

Disco is a decadent music for a decadent society. It is produced electronically; musical expertise is not necessary. Lyrics become unimportant; in point of fact, they must be repetitive, to emphasize the all-important beat. No subtle tones, riffs, or nuances are permissible, as they will interfere with the musical experience; disco is not meant to be listened to, but rather experienced. Disco is supposed to reverberate through one's body, causing one to jerk with the beat in the manner of a medieval flagellant.

Disco, I am told, is good for dancing. While I do not dance, I take exception to this claim: it is my contention that disco is lethal to dance. In order to dance to ballroom music, one must attain a certain proficiency in a skill. Modern and experimental dance require continuous and strenuous training in a skill that has become an artform. Square-dancing is at least a social activity. Even the "spontaneous" dancing of the sixties, ideally requires the dancer to experience and shape the music into a visual form: good "spontaneous" dancing requires talent.

Disco dancing, however, comes in two forms. Firstly, there is dancing for those who do not know how to dance: essentially, this involves a number of people waving their arms about and jumping up and down in response to the omnipresent beat. Some vague attachment to a partner, in terms of positioning and body attitude, is usually required. Secondly, there are so-called disco dances, such as the hustle. Unlike the traditional ballroom dances, these dances are designed to be as straightforward and mindless as possible, so that the canaille can learn them with ease.

Disco, in essence, is like television: it panders to the lowest common denominator. Disco music is purposefully vapid, non-innovative, and repetitive: it is designed for bad dancing, not for listening. More, it is designed to be danced to by ANYBODY, no matter how uncoordinated or talentless. Sufferers of muscular dystrophy must be ecstatic over the cultural acceptance of disco, as it enables them to take part in a social activity on the same level as other human beings. Ultimately, disco will be destructive of serious music in America, as it will discourage musicians from acquiring any real expertise with their music, lyricists and writers from producing innovative work as disco is a tight and exclusive genre, and industry producers from production of material with some artistic merit.

From a personal point of view, disco is destructive of the social environment in which I live. My idea of an enjoyable party is between ten and ten thousand people, a sufficient quantity of alcoholic potables, and witty conversation. My peers seem to believe that an enjoyable party consists of disco music played at as great a volume as possible, pseudo-erotic gyrations (euphemistically called "dancing"), and alcohol. One can only presume that the fact that American children are not taught to speak properly, nor to engage in conversation with any wit to speak of, leads them to enjoy activity where they are not forced to reveal the mundanity of their conversation; where the sole interpersonal interaction depends on body movement.